

December Issue

The C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*

A Publication

Of The

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION

OF

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

VOLUME 9 NUMBER 2
DECEMBER 1960

Oxford Standard Authors Paperbacks

In response to a growing demand, these definitive editions have been published in attractive and brightly-designed paperbound covers. The contents of these well-known books remain the same while the price has been greatly reduced for the student. The titles are:

SPENSER. *Poetical Works*

Edited by Smith and De Selincourt.

Glossary by H. Alexander

814 pp.

\$2.75

MILTON. *Poems*

Edited by H. Darbishire.

Revised edition 1958

644 pp.

\$2.00

BOSWELL. *Life of Johnson*

New edition reset 1953.

1516 pp.

\$2.75

BLAKE. *Poetical Works*

Edited by J. Sampson.

510 pp.

\$1.50

BYRON. *Poetical Works*

924 pp.

\$2.00

**COLERIDGE. *Poetical Works,*
*Excluding Drama***

Edited by E. H. Coleridge.

With some Notes by G. Saintsbury

638 pp.

\$1.50

KEATS. *Poetical Works*

Edited by H. W. Garrod.

New edition 1956.

504 pp.

\$1.25

SHELLEY. *Poetical Works*

Edited by T. Hutchinson.

936 pp.

\$1.75

WORDSWORTH. *Poetical Works*

Edited by T. Hutchinson.

936 pp.

\$1.75

If you plan to use as a prescribed text, please write for your free examination copy.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

480 University Avenue, Toronto 2.

December Issue

The C. A. U. T. *Bulletin*

A publication of

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Volume 9

December 1960

Number 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Choice of Targets — An Editorial	2
University Government — W. P. Thompson	4
Faculty Participation in College and University Government — A Report to the American Association of University Professors	9
University Staff Associations and the Australian Universities Commission R. H. Thorp	13
Some Views on Salary Setting — W. B. Cunningham	18
Notice of Publications	28
Report of the Income Tax Committee	30
Letter to the Editor — F. H. Underhill	31
Corrected Schedule of Minimum Salaries	32

Published four times a year. Subscription Rate: 1 year for \$2.00.
Executive Secretary: Dr. J. H. S. Reid, CAUT National office, Room 603,
Commonwealth Bldg., 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.
Editor: S. R. Mealing, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ont.
Advertising Office: Suite 611, 1030 St. Alexander St., Montreal, P. Q.
Telephone: UNiversity 6-1812.
Printed by Quality Press Limited, Montreal.
Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

A CHOICE OF TARGETS

An Editorial

There are two ways in which the structure of North American universities conspicuously departs from the classical pattern of university development in the Western world. The first is the pattern of lay control, of which a tentative A. A. U. P. report here reprinted says that it "was set early and has been maintained although the conditions that created it have in part disappeared." The second, a result of the first, is a hierarchical pattern of administration in which all authority runs from the top down and ultimate responsibility runs from the bottom up. Presidents and deans are commonly chosen from the faculty, but in no sense by it. This system is established among us by a century and a half of usage. Parts of it are established by law. The results achieved under it — not necessarily because of it — are impressive enough. But it has no claim to be considered sacrosanct. The service that academics can render to the society they live in is pre-eminently criticism, and criticism is like charity: it begins at home.

In this issue a former university president defends the pattern of lay control. He does not, however, defend the whole of the *status quo*. He thinks that the academic is more incompetent, outside his own field, than the layman; and he thinks that academic decisions can be separated from administrative and financial decisions. In spite of subscribing to these two North American folk myths, he "would like to see the faculty represented on the committee who recommend the appointment of a president". The Canadian university president must not only administer his university but also represent it before the governing board and before the public. The identity of a university resides in its faculty, who alone perform its essential functions of teaching and research. The president is therefore, in most of our universities, given the task of representing people who have had no voice in his appointment. Between him and his constituents — as

between administrators and teachers generally — there is a gap which we now fill informally, or by his reports to faculty meetings, or by faculty committees hanging on the administration's flanks. Where the university is small, these methods can work; but few of our universities have much hope or much intention of remaining very small. The larger the university becomes, the less goodwill and common sense can do without adequate formal machinery. The change that Dr. Thompson suggests is after all slight. It does not in itself threaten our established system of external authority. It might be a logical first step towards doing so; but people who do not relish that prospect may take comfort from the reflection that logic alone has not often led us to action.

Dr. Thompson calls attention, too, to the unreformed senate — as entrenched a feature of our universities as it is of our national politics. The composition and powers of our senates vary greatly, although their functions are generally academic. In none of them are more than a few members chosen by the faculty at large. Whether the senate assembles the concentrated wisdom, or only the concentrated senility, of the highest professorial ranks, it does not represent the university's community of scholars. Does anyone seriously believe that community to be unworthy of representation, even on academic matters? Where faculty councils or boards can perform its functions, the senate may be merely superfluous. It may equally well be harmful. Where its relation to the larger body is uncertain or unstable, faculty is bound to show the indecisiveness and confusion inherent, not in its members, but in its organization.

Canadian universities are not faced with the question of whether or not they need reform. They obviously do. The question is not even whether reform is possible, for progress is denied those who will not attempt the impossible. The question is where to begin.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

W. P. Thompson*

Since I was chief executive officer of the institution in which Professor Percy Smith acquired his experience of university affairs, it is scarcely to be expected that his views on university government** would meet with my approval. He neither affirmed nor denied that he was writing from sad personal experience of conditions which he described or at least envisioned. Readers will therefore have to decide for themselves the extent to which he was criticising and I am going to defend the government of our own university. At any rate I shall try, as no doubt he did, to make my comments (which are written at the kind invitation of the editor) of as general application as possible.

The essential conclusion of Professor Smith's article is that a university should be governed in every respect by its faculty. The board of governors should be merely the executive of the faculty, elected by them from among their own number. The president and other officers also should be elected by them and all appointments made by them. The budget should be drawn up and all moneys allotted by the faculty and spent by their agents. In short all decisions, whether of an academic, administrative or business nature, should be made by the teaching staff.

In developing his argument the author makes a number of statements which may be literally true but which nevertheless give erroneous impressions. For example, the statement that the board of governors hires the staff on the recommendation of the president is literally true for most universities. But it is equally true and more important that in nearly all universities the recommendation which the president submits to the board has been formulated by a committee of those members of the staff who are most concerned and most knowledgeable in the particular case. No doubt the extent to which the president participates as a member of appointment committees in making such recommendations varies from university to university (depending in part on the size of the institution) and from case to case in any one university. Sometimes in order to strengthen a weak department it may be necessary to remove some of the

*President Emeritus, University of Saskatchewan.

**This journal, Volume 8, Number 3: pp. 4-15, February 1960.

authority to recommend from those who will be the prospective appointee's closest colleagues and give it to those who are more likely to make a better recommendation. And no board will fail to carry out recommendations for appointments which have the president's support, if they wish to retain his services. Consequently, whatever the constitution may say, appointments are really made by the staff.

The statement that the staff hold office only at the board's pleasure is equally true in theory and equally false in practice. As everyone knows, it is almost impossible to dismiss a staff member. And if it is done, the board can act only on the president's recommendation, and any sensible president (and in spite of the criticisms of the way they are appointed most presidents are sensible) would arrange for an investigation and recommendation by a committee with staff representation.

Analogies may be useful to one who wishes to make a point but do not always clarify real issues and may confuse or distort them. This is true of the author's strongly emphasized analogy between a university and a business corporation with its comparison of the board of governors to a board of directors, the president to a general manager, the deans to plant managers, etc., and its picture of rebellious teachers accepting unwillingly the criteria of the business world. But a professor who thinks that it is more than an analogy and doesn't really understand the differences between the ways of a business corporation and those of a university, is in need of further education. To spell out those differences would take too much space.

Perhaps the article's greatest distortion of the real situation is in its location of authority. According to the author this lies entirely in the board of governors. Actually in most, if not all, universities the board has no authority in the most important area, namely, academic affairs, and that is the area in which the faculty should be chiefly interested. The constitution of most universities gives the staff authority in academic matters, and whatever the constitution may say, they would have it anyway, except for a possible restriction noted in the next paragraph. At any rate no member of a board would try to secure a decision in the board on a purely academic matter, or could do so if he were to try.

The only limitation on the authority of the staff in academic matters lies not with the board but with the senate. In this connection it is difficult to make generally applicable statements because the

powers of the senate vary so much from institution to institution, as does the representation in the senate of the faculty and other bodies such as alumni, affiliated colleges and professional societies. But if Mr. Smith would direct his guns at the senate instead of the board, I would be ready to support him, even to the extent of abolishing it or making it the elected executive of the faculty.

It is true that many of the board's decisions involving the expenditure of money affect academic affairs, for example, decisions regarding priorities in building construction, establishing new schools or departments, providing additional professorships, etc. And many academic changes desired by the faculty require money. But it has been my experience with one board (and I believe it is true of most other boards) that whenever a business matter appears to have important academic implications, the views of the faculty or of an appropriate section of it are secured either directly or through the senate. And whenever a clear expression of faculty or senate opinion is available, the members of the board regard it as their duty to implement that opinion if they can, insofar as it involves finances or administration.

It should also be pointed out that whatever the constitution may say, the staffs of most institutions already have much authority in administrative matters. Their role in appointments was mentioned earlier. They usually have the deciding voice (within the limits imposed by the general budget) in promotions, merit salary increases, research grants, travel grants, departmental budgets, etc. And in sensibly run institutions the views of appropriate sections of the faculty are obtained on many other administrative matters. Budgetary decisions above the departmental level cannot wisely be placed in the full authority of the faculty. It is likely that rules of thumb would be adopted which would actually work out injuriously or unjustly. Faculty members do their best to avoid decisions which may injure particular interests or persons or have the reverse effect on others. And for the welfare of the institution such decisions must be made. It is better to leave such decisions to experienced, thick-skinned administrators who expect to have to make them.

So far I have written about faults in Professor Smith's arguments. They are mostly faults of picturing conditions not as they are, but as they might be — conditions which would be theoretically possible

within the letter of university constitutions. We may now consider some arguments which are opposed to his conclusions.

To have the president elected by vote of the general faculty would be very unwise, particularly if there are two or more possible candidates in the same staff (and when wouldn't there be?), or if there is a weak candidate with vociferous friends. Some of the harmful effects of electing a president through general faculty debate can easily be envisioned. And without questioning the competence of faculty members, each in his own field, one must question the competence of many of them to select the best chief executive officer. For myself, I would like to see the faculty represented on the committee who recommend the appointment of a president — represented by one or more members in whom they have shown their confidence, for example, by electing them chairman or secretary of the faculty association. But it would have to be understood that their role would be the usual role of members of such committees and that they would not have to go to the full faculty for instructions.

Election of members of the board by the faculty from their own number would be open to similar objections. And matters which cannot be discussed in faculty without injury to the university or to persons sometimes come before the board where they must be discussed frankly if the best decisions are to be reached. In view of a well known propensity of faculty members, I fear there would be too much administration by gossip. That propensity does not preclude a strong reluctance to dealing with weak colleagues, or organizational weaknesses involving colleagues, in ways which are required by the welfare of the university.

Something should be said in favor of the present type of board member. It is easy to picture a board as composed of lawyers, business men and farmers who are ignorant of university affairs, who can't appreciate the importance of a library to a scholar, or the wastefulness of using a first-rate biologist on extension jobs. But whether they are elected by senate or alumni, or appointed by governments or other governors, they are almost invariably chosen because they are able leaders with a keen interest in the university and prepared to sacrifice much on its behalf. With their special qualities and experience they are able to make contributions which most faculty members would be unable to make. They are naturally men who know when to depend on others for expert opinion and advice. After many years of

experience of the actual functioning of both faculties and boards it is my considered opinion that governors as we now have them are better fitted for the type of work they have to do than an equal number of faculty members would be, particularly members who would be elected by a general vote.

A function of the board of governors which has always been of the greatest importance to provincial universities and has recently become of almost equal importance to private institutions, is to secure money from governments, and for that function they must have the confidence of those governments. Professor Smith points to the confidence which governments now show in professors by consulting them on many problems and asking them to undertake particular tasks. But that confidence, which we are all pleased and proud to observe, relates to the professors' fields of special technical expertness. In relation to general administration it is unlikely that governments would have as great confidence in professor-governors as they have in governors of the present type.

Finally, when a provincial government has to grant very large sums of money every year for a university's current expenditures in addition to large amounts for its capital needs, and when the work of universities is so important to governments, it is only fair and sound that the government should have the right to name at least half of those who are to spend the money and administer the institution. And when private institutions must find and spend equally large sums, it is not to be wondered at that they prefer to have those sums in charge of men who have proved themselves in affairs and have academic interests, rather than professors whose reputation in that area is not high and whose interest in it is usually slight.

Even if the conditions and actions which Professor Smith pictures and which may be theoretically possible under the present form of university government, were actually to occur — and he may have had a particular example in mind — they would be rare. And one may question the wisdom of making fundamental changes in that government in order to prevent a rare event, and thereby introduce conditions or actions which would be worse.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT*

The statement which follows was recently submitted to the Council of the Association as a Report by Committee T on College and University Government. The Council, on April 7, 1960, accepted the report as a tentative statement of principles and asked that it be printed in the *Bulletin* and circulated to the chapters for recommendations and comments. The opinions of individual members are, of course, very welcome.

A further note on the substance of the statement may be helpful. The document cleaves to principles and as much as possible avoids references to particular practices. Committee T hopes soon to begin work on a handbook descriptive of practices in faculty participation for each major kind of faculty involvement. There will be a review of significant, good, and poor arrangements, with full recognition that circumstances may vary and that more than one good practice may exist.

The members of Committee T submitting the report were: Ferrel Heady (Political Science), University of Michigan, *Chairman*; Ian Campbell (Geology), State Division of Mines, California; Arthur J. Dibden (Philosophy), Knox College; Wood Gray (History), George Washington University; Richard Hartshorne (Geography), University of Wisconsin; York Willbern (Political Science), Indiana University; Howard R. Williams (Law), Columbia University.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

PREAMBLE

The basic functions of a college or university are to augment, preserve, criticize and transmit knowledge and to foster creative capacities. These functions are performed by a community of scholars who must be free to exercise independent judgment in the planning and execution of their educational responsibilities. The organization of an institution of higher education should be designed to allow it to select and carry out its responsibilities with maximum effectiveness and integrity. The ultimate standard for judging patterns for college

*Reprinted, with the explanatory preface, from the A.A.U.P. *Bulletin*, Volume 46, Number 2 (June, 1960), pp. 203-4.

and university government is success in serving the purposes for which institutions of higher education exist.

Three groups play the most important roles in the government of American colleges and universities — faculties, administrators, and governing board members. Criteria for college and university government must delineate the respective responsibilities of these groups, none of which has exclusive claim to represent society as a whole in the conduct of higher education. Moreover, since existing relationships are the result of historical development, the possibility of improvements in these relationships should be constantly reviewed.

The present pattern for government of American institutions of higher education provides for the exercise of broad legal powers by boards composed almost exclusively of laymen who are not members of the academic profession. Viewed historically, perhaps the most important factor productive of lay control was the absence of a considerable body of professional scholars of repute to whom a larger measure of responsibility for college government could be entrusted. The pattern of lay control was set early and has been maintained although the conditions that created it have in part disappeared.

Meanwhile, two important developments have produced substantial departures in practice from the original pattern of control by a lay governing board. One is the gradual professionalization of college and university teaching and the growth of a scholarly community of maturity and talent fully qualified to take an active and responsible part in institutional government. The other is that the size of American institutions of higher education and the diversity of their operations have created a need for an increasing number of institutional officers who can devote full time to the administrative aspects of higher education. These administrative officials, particularly the college or university presidents and academic deans, have come to exercise important roles of leadership and control.

Reflecting this gradual evolution, American colleges and universities typically exhibit marked contrast between legal power and operative power. The actual process of policy making no longer ordinarily conforms to the legal prescriptions which place formal authority in the hands of governing boards; over the years exercise of these powers by boards has been curtailed by self-denying ordinances and self-restraint. A functional sharing of powers has often been achieved

within a framework of organic laws that ordain a concentration of powers. Actual practices of institutional operation now generally acknowledge the joint responsibility of faculties, administrators, and boards.

Nevertheless, there are still considerable areas of doubt and disagreement over respective spheres of action. These reflect in part basic differences of opinion, and in part confusion and uncertainty where ill-defined powers conflict or overlap. The situation varies a great deal from institution to institution, and often from time to time at the same institution.

The objective of this statement is to set forth appropriate principles with regard to the participation of faculties in the government of institutions of higher education. An explicit formulation of these principles should serve to bring about a better understanding on the part of all three groups of their proper roles and mutual relationships. Since the variety of situations is great, this statement of principles does not attempt to describe the detailed arrangements which might establish the principles in practice.

PRINCIPLES

1. *Faculty representation in college and university government.* Agencies of faculty representation, chosen in a manner determined by the faculty, should be provided at each major organizational level in the institution concerned (department, school or college, geographical unit, or university system as a whole). Such agencies may involve the faculty meeting as a whole or may take the form of faculty-selected executive committees in departments and schools, and a faculty senate or council for the geographical unit or the institution as a whole.

Communication with the governing board of the institution should not be confined to the chief administrative officers. Other forms of representation or communication should be provided, such as membership of faculty representatives or of other persons nominated by the faculty on the governing board, joint board-faculty committees, attendance at board meetings by the principal elected officer or officers of the faculty, and systematic exchange of information between the board and faculty.

The rules governing procedures for faculty representation and participation in institutional government should be officially adopted and should be readily available to all concerned. Decisions as to the

area and extent of faculty representation and participation in college and university government should involve the judgment of the faculty.

2. *Educational and research policy.* The faculty should have major responsibility for the educational and research policy of the institution. This policy area includes such fundamental matters as standards of admission of students, student affairs, curricula, and the granting of degrees. Preferably, legal responsibility for educational policy should be placed with the faculty. If this is not possible, operating responsibility should be delegated to it by the board. The right of final determination inherent in the legal position of the typical board should be exercised only in exceptional circumstances and should always be accompanied by a statement of reasons.

3. *Budgeting.* The allocation of available resources among competing demands has such obvious and important implications for educational and research policy as to call for a direct role by the faculty in the making of budget decisions at all levels.

4. *Academic personnel.* Appointments, promotions, and dismissals of academic personnel should be made only by processes that provide for active faculty participation through established committees and procedures.

5. *Administrative personnel.* College and university administrative officials occupy dual positions. As officers of administration, they are responsible through the president to the governing board for the effective conduct of the affairs of the institution. As officially designated leaders of the faculty, they are also responsible for representing their respective faculty groups in the making of policy decisions.

The chairman or head of an academic department should be elected by the members of the department or should be appointed after consultation with, and normally in conformity with the judgment of, the members of the department. He should serve for a limited term, but without restriction as to reelection or reappointment after consultation.

The selection and dismissal of deans, presidents, and other academic administrative offices should involve meaningful participation by the faculty through its elected representatives. Such officers, at all levels, should normally be qualified for faculty membership by training, experience, and continued interest in teaching and research. The

principles of academic tenure are applicable to faculty members holding administrative positions only in their faculty capacity; continuance in positions with purely administrative functions is subject to reconsideration at any time.

6. *Institutional relations with the public.* Institutions of higher education, public or private, can fulfill their functions in society only if there is adequate understanding of the values of the college or university by the public, and a recognition by the institution of its opportunities and obligations. Board members, administrators, and faculty members should share the task of maintaining institutional relations with the public.

UNIVERSITY STAFF ASSOCIATIONS AND THE AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION

R. H. Thorp*

The present time is a vital period in the history of the Australian Universities since it marks the end of the triennium covered by the Murray Report and the beginning of the period of activity of the Australian Universities Commission. On the vision and foresight of this Commission now depends the growth and prosperity of our Universities and the satisfaction and enthusiasm of their staffs.

Over the last ten or twelve years the population has increased in a remarkable manner — in fact by $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ per annum. This increase is particularly important in the field of education since it is greatest in the younger age groups. Partly as a result of the post-war increase in birthrate and partly because of the emigration programme which started in 1947 bringing to Australia many families with young children, there is now a quite remarkable increase in the teenage group. There is a much greater awareness of the need for advanced education among the young people themselves, employers and parents as well, and the prosperity of Australia is attracting more students to enter the professions than ever before.

In 1957 there were 36,465 students enrolled in the Universities of Australia and it is predicted that this number will rise to at least 70,000 by 1965. This has brought about the need for a vast increase

*Professor Thorp, of the University of Sydney, is president of the Federal Council of the University Staff Associations of Australia.

in educational facilities and demands a much greater distribution of communal wealth into the building of schools, universities, and educational institutions than would normally be envisaged.

The Universities of Australia are State Universities with the exception of the Australian National University and Canberra University Colleges which are the direct responsibilities of the Commonwealth Government.

Although the universities are supported by a large measure of finance from the various State Governments they are all autonomous and are administered by their Senates, Councils or Governing Bodies. Although fees are paid by students this does not bulk very significantly in the income of these universities. Neither do private bequests and investments help a great deal. Most of the money has to be found by the State Treasuries, and a formula was established in 1950 by which the Commonwealth Government could provide additional funds to the States for the Universities, but only on condition that they could qualify for it by giving adequate finance to their own universities first. This formula meant that the Commonwealth Government made available £1 for every £3 which a university derived from its State government and from fees. In spite of this the universities experienced a state of dire and increasing poverty until the coming of help from the Murray Committee's recommendations in 1958.

The Universities of Australia geographically are separated in some cases by thousands of miles, and although ten years ago each had a staff association there was no contact between these bodies in the different institutions. This led to the development of the Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia about this time. At first the Council was a somewhat nebulous organisation meeting once a year in one of the capital cities, and having as its delegates any two members of an Australian University Staff Association who might happen to be in that city at that time. This Council, comprising then some sixteen or eighteen members, elected its Executive, discussed very briefly a number of very important problems and then dispersed to the far corners of the Continent. The Executive did what it could with a minute budget and voluntary labour and with no proper organ of communication.

After years of agitation, pressure, and publicity by the Federal Council, Staff Associations and all branches of the universities, it

became apparent to the Commonwealth Government that something drastic would have to be done and in 1957 the Commonwealth Government appointed the Committee on the Australian Universities, with Sir Keith Murray as Chairman. The "Murray Committee" became a by-word of hope for the Australian Universities.

The Federal Council had by this time developed along vigorous lines and has a part to play in the Federal aspects of university affairs. It should have a relationship with the Vice-Chancellor's Committee similar to that of a Staff Association with its Vice-Chancellor. The Council is also the medium through which the constituent associations are now kept informed of each others activities, proposals and programmes.

The Staff Associations in each University and the Federal Council made submissions to the Murray Committee, and in its report the Committee expressed satisfaction with the submission made by the Federal Council, and found that at each University the local staff representatives were in agreement with that submission.

The Report of the Murray Committee was a blood transfusion to a dying man, and its prompt implementation raised the staff salaries and provided immediate financial aid on a scale which the universities had never previously experienced. Capital grants were made for building programmes in each university, and in this case the formula was based on a 1: 1 ratio, (or better in some cases), allocation of Commonwealth assistance in relation to State grants and fees. Emergency grants were also recommended for the period 1958-60, intended to remedy the urgent deficiencies which were apparent. These grants were provided entirely from Commonwealth funds.

It is perfectly true to say that all of us who made contact with Sir Keith Murray and his Committee in 1957 were impressed and enthusiastic, and the outcome justified our enthusiasm.

Among the many recommendations that the Murray Committee made was the appointment of the Australian Universities Commission and the Act to establish the Commission in 1959 defined that this body should comprise a Chairman and two to four other members appointed from time to time. The members of the Commission have been meeting since about a year ago, under the Chairmanship of Sir Leslie Martin, and even before Sir Leslie had chosen his colleagues, informal discussions took place between him and representatives of the Federal Council. These discussions were cordial and encouraging

and in fact he invited our reaction to various suggestions he had in mind, including the composition of his Commission. He drew attention at this time to a clause in the Act which says firstly, that the Commission "shall perform its functions with a view to promoting the balanced development of universities so that their resources can be used to the greatest possible advantage of Australia", and secondly, "For the purpose of the performance of its functions, the Commission shall consult with universities and with the States upon the matters on which it is empowered to furnish information and advice".

This Clause is a sound and well-meaning one, but the first part could cause a lot of embarrassment to the Universities because it might mean that one discipline, demanding a high level of finance, might be restricted to one University. Federal Council could see the reasons for this part, but provided its implementation was the result of most careful consultation and collaboration between the Commission and the Universities, did not view this with apprehension.

By far the biggest item of expenditure in any university is that of salaries, and right from our early contact with the Universities Commission it seemed that this body was reluctant to face up to this problem. The Federal Council and the individual Staff Associations have been repeatedly accused of concentrating their attention on salaries, of making themselves into Trade Unions, of embarrassing their employers and being concerned with little else than the mundane matter of recompense. This charge is quite without foundation. The Staff Associations of the Australian Universities are concerned with the welfare of the Universities first and foremost, but the salaries situation has been such in the past that they could not ignore this major item of expenditure. Some ten or twelve years ago a University Professor received a salary very little different from that of a skilled tradesman engaged in the vast business of building homes for the expanding population. This situation was well exemplified by a press cartoon based on figures from "Situations Vacant", depicting an academic gentleman being invited to join the garbage disposal team where the wages were rather better.

Over the past ten years the salary situation has improved encouragingly, which it certainly needed to do, but still the recompense of an academic career cannot compare with a career in the private professions or in certain branches of the Commonwealth Government.

At the end of 1959 the Arbitration Courts awarded salary increases to skilled workers in very many trades, a system of adjustment which is well accepted in this country. Corresponding increases became common in many fields of professional employment directly comparable with the universities, so the Federal Council pointed out that their application to University Staff members should surely be almost automatic too, and conferred with the Commission on this point. The Chairman categorically stated that such increases could not be considered by this body since its first triennium did not commence until 1961. The matter was, he said, one for negotiation between the individual Staff Association and their Vice-Chancellors. Negotiations of this kind in New South Wales resulted, after some discussion, in the Universities of Sydney and of New South Wales agreeing to pay the full increases as soon as finance was available, but then came a surprising intervention by the Australian Universities Commission which recommended smaller increases in salary, a recommendation which had been made without consultation of the Federal Council or even the universities most concerned. In New South Wales the recommendation has not prevented the Treasury from implementing the increases agreed to in its three universities, but in the other States a much less happy condition exists where the Commission's reduced figure has been seized upon. As if this were not enough the Commission has now set up a Committee to investigate the level of salaries which should be paid in the 1961-3 triennium. This Committee is neither a disinterested one — since three of its members are directly connected with the Commonwealth Treasury or University Governing Bodies — nor is it a representative one since Staff Associations or the Federal Council have no representation but merely are given the roles of petitioners who were invited to make submissions. This invitation was also extended generally by advertisements in the national newspapers!

The Federal Council is most unhappy about this whole affair. It sees no reason for such a Committee since consultation between the Australian Universities Commission, the Vice-Chancellor's Committee, and the Federal Council would have been quite appropriate. It does not like the *ex parte* nature of the majority of the appointments to the Committee and it rightly feels that free and frank discussion between the Australian Universities Commission and itself would have brought about some arrangement satisfactory to both parties.

University staff members are wondering how the collaborative spirit of the Murray Committee became so quickly dissipated and how the A.U.C. is going to behave in the future.

In spite of such preoccupation the Federal Council has established the Australian Universities' Quarterly, "VESTES" on a very sound basis and articles are being submitted so that each issue becomes filled almost as soon as the previous one is in press. The interest in "VESTES" is now considerable and the Editors are thinking of offering nominal subscription rates to make it available to those who do not receive it by virtue of their position as Australian academics, or by international exchange, since although one wishes to be as generous as possible postage alone is today a big item.

In 1961 the Federal Council is planning a two-day Universities' Conference dealing with university problems and in this it is expected that the Vice-Chancellor's Committee will take an encouraging interest. This will be the first of its kind in Australia and a most necessary development in such a virile and developing environment. Truly this is a crucial period for University development in Australia and the more we write about it, discuss it and collect ideas, the better job we shall make of the future.

SOME VIEWS ON SALARY SETTING

W. B. Cunningham*

Academic excellence should be the general objective of any university. Administrative decisions, including those on salaries, should be made with reference to this objective. By "a good salary structure", then, is meant one which contributes to academic excellence. The contribution is not direct, but indirect; through the effects on the attitudes and behaviour of present and prospective faculty members. An ideal salary structure is high enough to attract and retain the best scholars, and avoids discontent by avoiding inequities. A salary structure is "good" in direct proportion to its closeness to this ideal.

It follows, then, that to be judged "good" a salary structure must meet the tests of height and equity. There is no formula to

*Associate Professor of Economics, Mount Allison University.

provide correct answers to questions of equity. Even the simpler problem of a correct salary level cannot be solved by a formula. The answers depend upon administrative judgement. The correctness of the results reflects the wisdom of these judgements.

These judgements must be made within a framework of economic pressures; and with reference to certain principles which are present in varying degrees of clarity and vagueness. Assuming the acceptance of academic excellence as the objective, the following discussion on principles and problems of salary setting is intended to assist the making of good judgements. For the discussion a convenient, though arbitrary, distinction is made between the general salary level and the internal salary structure.

GENERAL SALARY LEVEL

Whereas academic excellence should be the objective of a university, scholarly work should be its business. A university student should not do his work to get a degree, but should get a degree because his work has been scholarly. Somewhat similarly, a university teacher should not do his work to get his salary, but should get his salary so he can continue his scholastic work. But to do his work properly he requires sufficient income to avoid continuous concern about immediate and pressing financial needs. He requires a reasonable degree of freedom from the worries of financial insecurity. Such freedom will not automatically result in a high level of scholarship in teaching and research; but good scholarship is unlikely if such freedom is absent. This, rather than an unlimited appetite for money, is one source of faculty concern about salary levels.

Another source of concern is the effect of salary levels on the recruitment and retention of staff. Adequate staffing may well be the most difficult problem for Canadian universities during the next ten years. Assuming that the 1958-59 ratio of 14.3 students to one teacher is maintained, the Canadian Universities Foundation, after a careful study, has stated that the number of full-time university teachers "will have to be increased from the estimated 6,610 of 1958-59 to approximately 16,000 in 1970-71." (*Staffing the Universities and Colleges of Canada*. Part I, p. 1.) This estimated 250% increase in staff required by 1970 is not the whole story. Many of the present teachers, probably 25-30%, will retire or leave teaching during this ten-year period. Replacements will have to be found for them. Further-

more, the preceding estimates are based on expected future student enrolments. The students of the 1960's are already born so the calculation is only an estimate of what proportion will attend university. In 1955 the predicted student enrolment for 1958-59 was 82,000. (*Proceedings*, N.C.C.U., 1955. pp. 39-46) The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported that the actual enrolment in 1958-59 was 94,400. (*Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges*, 1958. p. 5.) The actual enrolment was 14.8% greater than the one predicted only three years earlier! As the C.U.F. study comments: "Projected enrolments seem fated to be outdone by actual attendance." (*Staffing*. p. 2.) The obtaining of faculty members can be expected to become increasingly difficult.

In the search for staff a university must compete with other universities; with those in other parts of the same country and in foreign countries. The universities in general must compete with industry and government in this search for disciplined minds. Fortunately, universities can offer the attractions of a stimulating academic environment, something which is uncommon in non-university employment. A salary differential can exist between industry and government on the one hand and universities on the other, with recruitment of staff at lower salaries remaining possible for the universities. The strongest competition, accordingly, is that of other universities.

University salaries can be lower than those of business and government. Here it is the size of the differential that is significant. How large this can become without seriously interfering with the search for university teachers can only be determined by experience. One criterion is suggested. If recently graduated B.A. and B.Sc. students can receive a higher starting salary from business than is paid by universities to their beginning Lecturers, such students are unlikely to choose a career in university teaching, requiring as it does several years of graduate study, further costly expenses, postponement of immediate income and an expectation (almost a certainty) of a lower possible maximum income in later years. The conclusion is obvious. The minimum salary for the rank of Lecturer should exceed the salaries offered by industry for students with a Bachelor's degree.

The economic valuations of the market create a perplexing problem for university salary administration. The market forces yield a much higher valuation for the services of scientists than for the services of those whose knowledge is of less direct use in the search for profits. Should a university accept the market valuations, paying

more for teachers of scientific subjects than for other teachers, even if the latter possess comparable academic qualifications and experience? If a university does so, it violates a widely accepted principle of equity, namely, the equal treatment of equals. The discrimination would certainly lower the morale of the faculty and their respect for the university. If it does not apply the market valuations but attempts to follow the principle of equal treatment of equals one of two results will follow. Salaries to scientists for teaching will be much lower than for their alternative employments and many of the best scientists will not enter university teaching. Or, salaries to non-scientists will be higher than what is necessary to obtain their services and the university will appear to be extravagant at the same time that it is appealing to business for funds. Is there a solution?

The answer lies in the phrase "will appear to be extravagant." The market valuations which are valid for the pursuit of profit are not necessarily valid for the pursuit of academic excellence. The market forces do impose minimums which can only be disregarded by the sacrifice of quality. But above these minimums academic salaries should reflect academic, not market, valuations. It does not follow that a university is wasteful and extravagant if its salaries exceed the non-university market rates.

Universities were hostile to science and scientists in earlier centuries. It is good that scientific achievements have forced the acceptance of these disciplines by universities. It would be bad as well as ironical if the traditional university respect for the humanities should diminish. This discussion suggests the following conclusion. Salary levels should be high enough to attract good scientists while avoiding salary differentials between teachers with equal experience and qualifications.

Salary levels may have an influence on promotion policies. A discussion of the desirable principles which should govern the academic rank to be awarded to each teacher is beyond the scope of this report. There is a temptation, however, to award a higher academic rank primarily as a device to increase a teacher's income without violating a salary scale. The practice is a subterfuge; a form of academic inflation which merits the widespread condemnation it receives. If academic ranks are to be meaningful they must be determined on other grounds. If academic promotions are only a means for preserving the stability of a salary scale the ranks lose their significance

and should be abolished. Indeed, if a salary scale is so low that a university must offer an Associate Professorship to attract recent Ph.D. graduates then both the scale and the rank are meaningless. The appearance of the temptation is the clear signal that the salary scale needs adjusting. Administrators should heed the signal.

The prestige of university teachers requires a brief comment. Man is an emotional and passionate being as well as a rational one. Rational thought is a natural opponent of the emotions and passions of man. There will always be, consequently, a certain hostility towards intellectuals and their work. "Long hair" and "egg head" are not terms of endearment. Combined with this basic hostility is the prevailing attitude, at least on this continent, which measures success by material gain. The result, when hucksters of soap receive larger incomes than Shakespearian scholars, is the addition of a mixture of pity and contempt in society's attitude towards "absent-minded" professors. Those who are convinced of the importance of intellectual activity should at least ponder the harm to it which can follow such attitudes. The hostility will likely remain. The pity and contempt need not.

Related to the foregoing is the change in the relative income shares of university teachers and other economic groups. The combined effects of rising prices, rising productivity and rising money incomes are never distributed evenly. The experience of university teachers since 1939 illustrates how uneven the effects may be. In 1957-58 the real income of Canadian university teachers was 15% higher than in 1939. That of manufacturing workers was 60% higher — a real increase, in percentage terms, four times greater than that of the university teacher. Such a relative shift may, or may not, be desirable. To the extent that it was due to the haphazard effects of inflation it indicates that the incomes of university teachers are likely casualties of inflationary periods. Many economists believe that our economy has a built-in inflationary bias. There has been, in this century certainly, a long-term upward trend in prices, a trend that shows no signs of reversal. In view of this some universities in their salary structures have included payments contingent upon changes in the general level of prices. Such payments are designed to prevent the erosions of real income in an inflationary period. Until the threat of inflation is effectively curbed there is merit in such plans.

INTERNAL SALARY STRUCTURE

Salary scales are desirable and, in some form, probably inevitable. Most university salary scales specify a minimum salary for each academic rank. Apart from this common element there is much diversity. Sometimes maximums are stated for each rank. A maximum for one rank may be above, but more often is equal to, the minimum for the next higher rank. The range between the minimum and the maximum may, or may not, be greater for higher ranks. Some universities pay regular annual increments until the top of a given range is reached; others recognize and reward experience by granting salary increases, but the size of the increase is neither certain nor known beforehand. Because inequities are difficult to avoid, the decisions on these details are of some importance.

Inequities commonly occur when there is: 1) a compression of the scale from the bottom, and 2) a change of the entire scale. These are discussed in turn.

1. Through time the minimum salary for the rank of Lecturer may become obsolete. Because of rising salaries elsewhere, a university may find it necessary to offer more than its minimum to attract new teachers. The *de facto* minimum is raised although the explicit scale is unchanged. (The subterfuge of offering a higher rank has already been exposed.) This leads to a narrowing of the range between the salary of beginning lecturers and experienced teachers in the ranks. Such a practice is made possible by the lower mobility of the older teachers. Faculty members may accept salary discrimination rather than undergo the painful severing of cherished friendships, disruption of children's education, discarding of community responsibilities and privileges, and the disposal of the mortgaged home. But thoughts about long and faithful service may be bitter. The respect of the older faculty for the university will not grow.

The new teachers, moreover, will reach the top of the salary range for their rank in a shorter time. To retain them, if the scale is unchanged, may well require an appointment to a higher rank earlier than their qualifications and experience warrant. For the sake of the income, they accept, but they are not fooled by the method. Consequently the university does not gain their respect anymore than it retained the esteem of its older teachers. The entire salary scale may have to be periodically changed to prevent such results.

2. Changing the salary scale can produce an inequity of another kind. A teacher may be receiving a salary which is higher than the current minimum for his rank. If the scale is increased the teacher will receive a higher salary but its relative position on the range for his rank may fall. Consider a salary range of \$5000 - \$6000 for an Instructor, and a teacher with that rank who is receiving \$5400. If the new scale provides a range of \$6000 - \$7600 for this rank and the teacher's new salary is less than \$6600 (less than 40% along the salary range of \$1600) his relative standing within his rank is not maintained. He may look upon this as an injustice and perhaps suspect that it is a deliberate attempt to prolong his advancement to a higher rank. He may have other thoughts. He may wonder if this is an indirect expression of disapproval of his work or behaviour; and wonders why 'they' do not have the courage to tell him directly. Possibly university professors should not be so sensitive about what may only be the accidents of administrative life. But professors are people, and such thoughts occur.

Suppose, on the other hand, the teacher in the above example is raised to \$6600. He will still be 40% of the way along the new range for his rank. Perhaps he will think that his additional year's work entitles him to a further advancement in the range to, say, 50% — a salary of \$6800. If progression within a range is a reward for merit and experience the teacher has a logical argument. But the internal progression is commonly postponed in a year when the entire scale is raised. If this applies to all the teachers there is, with one exception, no inequity.

The exception occurs with the appointment of new teachers at the time the revised scale becomes effective. The new appointees will usually be paid the minimum salary for the new scale. Faculty members appointed one or two years previously may not have begun to advance as yet within the salary range of their rank (unless there is a policy of annual increments). If they receive no increment in addition to the raising of the scale their salaries will be the same as the new appointees. If the previous scale had remained in force those presently employed might reasonably have expected and received some progression along the scale. Faculty members expect to receive, after one or two years of service, a higher salary than that paid to the most recent appointee. This is the common policy of business

firms and government. The absence of a similar policy in universities is not a serious omission; but it may produce some minor irritations.

Should a teacher's salary automatically increase with his years of service? Few persons object to the principle that salaries should vary directly, although not necessarily proportionally, with the teacher's length of time in the profession. To the extent that promotions in rank depend upon length of service this relationship is achieved. But there is also general agreement within the academic profession that promotions should depend as much, or more, upon academic achievements as upon length of service. Promotion policies should be, so far as is possible, separate from salary policies. When the two are merged confusion follows. The importance which administrators should attach to years of service in determining promotions is a problem this report ignores. But continuous service merits some reward and a known schedule of annual increments is probably the fairest way to express it. Such a schedule eliminates the uncertainty of arbitrary or negotiated *ad hoc* increments. It also eliminates one possible source of inequitable discrimination.

Should the annual increments cease when the salary reaches the maximum for a given rank, further increments being possible only after a promotion in rank? This question suggests a further one. Should the maximum for one rank overlap or exceed the minimum for the next higher rank? The desirability of separating salary and promotion policies indicates an advantage in having the salary ranges overlap. Overlapping provides greater flexibility to a university in recognizing length of service as distinct from academic achievement. With overlapping there would be occasions when the university paid a higher salary to a teacher in one rank than paid to one in the next higher rank. To do so is neither illogical nor inequitable. Lengthy service without academic distinction receives one type of reward; brief service with distinction receives a different type. The greater the range of overlapping the greater is the possibility of separating salary and promotion decisions.

LONG RANGE SALARY PLANNING

In its pursuit of academic excellence a university should give thought to more than its most immediate and pressing needs. A succession of temporary solutions to urgent problems is the most unlikely method for the achievement of objectives. Realizing this,

most universities make estimates of their future requirements of such things as classroom and laboratory space, residences, dining halls, parking areas and recreational facilities. If these are to be increased, financial estimates and fund-raising programs are prepared. Provided the university knows what number of students is consistent with its objective of academic excellence and with its prospective financial resources, such planning is highly commendable. But financing is required for more than buildings and equipment. Staff needs, as well as building needs, vary directly with student enrolment and money is required to meet these needs. Logically, long-range financial plans and fund raising programs should include estimates of future salary costs. If they are not included the university may later discover that it has money to obtain good buildings and no money to obtain good teachers.

It is as important to provide for faculty in the future as for buildings in the future. Surely the actual salary structure in the future is more likely to be consistent with the pursuit of academic excellence if current salary decisions are made with reference to a pre-determined longer-range salary objective, than if they are based on meeting the most pressing needs of the coming year. To expect good results from the latter approach is unrealistic.

Universities commonly announce their plans for future buildings. An explicitly stated objective for future staff and salary levels is equally desirable. This demonstration of purposefulness should improve the prestige of the university. And salary review, then, would concern the adequacy of the long-range objective. The actual outcome should be less haphazard and more logical.

JOINT DISCUSSIONS

At several Canadian universities a committee of the governing Board meets with a Faculty committee for a joint discussion of salaries. There is merit in such a procedure. (And also dangers.) Faculty members know the current thinking of their colleagues better than anyone else and can explain to the governors the nature of any strongly held views or attitudes among the staff. On the other hand the governors have a better appreciation of the current financial problems and can explain the nature of these to the Faculty committee. A reciprocal exchange of views should benefit both, and hence benefit the university.

The former President of the University of Saskatchewan, W. P. Thompson, has stated a similar opinion:

The organization of universities may give rise to an unhealthy feeling on the part of some faculty members that faculty and board are necessarily in opposition to each other — that they are natural enemies. But it has been my experience . . . that in most matters of general concern the two are in fundamental agreement The better the machinery for making the views and attitudes and difficulties of each known to the other, as well as for making them personally acquainted with each other, the less ground there is for a feeling of opposition. ("The Faculty Association and the Administration." *C.A.U.T. Bulletin*, October, 1958. p. 7)

The dangers can be avoided. Their appearance depends upon the attitude and approach of the committee members — faculty and governors. Faculty members must think and behave like scholars, not like hired employees. Board members must think and behave like wise governors, not like masters of a labour force. There must be a joint commitment to the pursuit of academic excellence, in which the strategies and tactics suitable to the conduct of privately-owned profit-seeking business firms have no place. If teachers look upon themselves only as hired employees, or even meekly accept such a status, governors are almost forced to act like employers. Similarly, if governors insist on behaving like employers, teachers are likely to react like employees. Instead of an employer-employee relationship, both should be the servants of academic ideals. In a university (if nowhere else) reason, rather than power of position, should force decisions.

CONCLUSION

University teachers do not behave like the mythical economic man. The earlier discussion may have created an impression that the typical professor is attracted to the task which promises the highest monetary awards; and it may seem to picture him as continuously and jealously guarding his relative income status. If these impressions have been created by what has been said above, they can be easily dispelled by a reference to empirical evidence.

The continued existence of higher salaries in non-academic employments reflects the extent to which non-monetary returns attract professors. Briefly, these returns flow from the host of things which contribute to a stimulating academic environment. They cannot be

discussed here. But a university, in its concern with salaries, should not neglect the importance of non-monetary attractions.

University teachers after 1939 experienced a substantial decline in their incomes relative to other groups. The older teachers also experienced a compression of salary scales as beginning salaries increased more rapidly than those at the top. But neither the older teachers nor teachers in general revolted against these trends. Only in recent years has there been any marked protest. The delay in making a protest, and the mildness of it, is further evidence that teachers do not seek material gain as a first objective.

Having said this, however, it does not follow that economic considerations have no influence on the behaviour of teachers. There is plenty of empirical evidence to the contrary. In accepting an appointment at another university, for example, a teacher seldom receives a salary lower than what he received in his former appointment, and usually the salary is higher. It would be naïve to expect otherwise.

If universities are to continue to perform their traditional and vital functions they require a continuous supply of first-rate teachers and researchers. Inadequate pay and inequitable treatment will reduce the supply. University teachers (in addition to administrators and the community at large) have a duty to maintain the attractions of a university career; they should do so by pointing to any present deficiencies and by requesting any needed changes. To do less is to shirk a responsibility.

NOTICE OF PUBLICATIONS

The seventh edition of *Canadian Universities and Colleges*, a biennial handbook, has appeared. It is a condensed calendar, not a general reference work on higher education in Canada, but it includes notes on other sources of information. It is published by the Canadian Universities foundation, 77 Metcalfe Street, Ottawa, at \$3.00, postage free.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has just released *University Teachers' Salaries, 1937-1960*, which contains data from 17 universities, for five ranks and three regions, from 1937-38 to 1959-60. It

will take the place of the 1959-60 edition of *Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Universities and Colleges*, as for 1959-60 a limited survey of only 17 institutions was undertaken by the Bureau. A more completed and detailed survey is now underway for 1960-61.

As well as giving salary distributions, quartiles and medians, the publication contains a short appendix suggesting sources for data prior to 1937-38, information regarding Canadian and United States salaries from a survey published in 1908, and a short discussion of various methods for calculating average salaries.

Data for the 17 institutions included have been revised to exclude part-time staff, religious personnel paid on a scale less than that applying to lay staff, and staff with ranks below that of lecturer or instructor. While figures for certain ranks for some early years are incomplete, the material should prove useful to persons interested in salary trends.

It is priced at 75¢, is bilingual, contains 35 pages, and may be ordered from the Publications Distribution Section, D. B. S., Ottawa, or the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, Ottawa.

WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICE OF CANADA

announces that its

**Twelfth International Seminar
will be held in Sweden during July 1961.**

Canadian faculty members who are interested in serving
on the Seminar staff are asked to contact:

MISS BARBARA THOMAS, Assistant Secretary,
World University Service of Canada,
22, Willcocks Street, Toronto 5, Ontario.

Group Insurance

is a valuable part of any employee benefit program
Those who enjoy the security of Canada Life Group Insurance
know that they have the experience of the oldest Canadian
life insurance company working on their behalf.

The **CANADA LIFE**
Assurance Company

REPORT OF THE INCOME TAX COMMITTEE to the June 1960 meeting of the Council

It is not easy to make a fully justifiable case for deduction of expenses by University Teachers, as distinct from other individuals who receive income from employment. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander and clearly there must be countless cases where other individuals in employment might equitably claim that deduction should be allowed them. Why university teachers, for instance, instead of teachers in general? We are asking for special treatment where equity would actually justify general deductibility, by any individual, from employment income in similar circumstances.

The committee thinks that the strongest argument for the university teacher, as distinct from other individuals in employment, is that his income from employment as a university teacher is, in effect, income from the carrying on of his profession, since he is a professional man who can exercise his profession of university teaching only through employment. Whether the university teacher has a professional status not also possessed by, for example, the high school teacher, may be open to doubt.

Since section 5(2) of the Act has already made specific provision for deduction of travelling and accommodation expenses by construction workers, (a concession first made in 1957), recommendation has been made for a similar concession to university teachers, engaged on summer school work or as travelling professors. Had it not been for this, the most likely approach would probably have been to ask for classification of such supplementary income as income from a "business", which includes income from a profession. This has been added as an alternative suggestion.

The committee, then, has made the best case it can for special treatment of university teachers. It remains to stress, as energetically as possible, that all the income of university teachers from teaching is professional income. If this were conceded there would be no difficulty in claiming deductibility of all reasonable expenses, of the types dealt with in the submission to the Department of National Revenue.

(Signed) KENNETH F. BYRD, *Chairman*
DONALD R. PATTON
A. R. MARSHALL

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Editor,

C.A.U.T. Bulletin.

116 Springfield Road,
Ottawa, 2 May, 1960.

Sir,

In a letter in your April number Mr. J. E. G. Dixon of United College, Winnipeg, complains of statements of mine about the Crowe case and especially of my remark that the Crowe letter was "stolen." The letter was sent by Professor Crowe in Kingston to Professor Packer in United College, Winnipeg. It did not reach the man to whom it was addressed. Someone must have picked up the envelope and opened it — presumably, after it had been delivered by the Post Office to United College — and then sent on the letter to Principal Lockhart. I call this the action of a thief. An honest man, picking up such a letter, would either have put the envelope (unopened) into a postbox or have left it in the United College office (unopened) for delivery to Professor Packer.

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

TEACHING POSITIONS OPEN

The University of Alberta invites applications for positions in the Department of English, in Edmonton and Calgary, commencing September 1, 1961. Appointments will be made in the ranks of Lecturer and Assistant Professor at salaries up to \$8,000, depending on qualifications.

Each candidate is asked to send a personal letter of application with a full account of his career and interests, a transcript of record, a recent photograph or snapshot, and the names of three or more references. He would save time if he asked the referees to write immediately without waiting for a further request; their communications will be gratefully acknowledged.

Applications and testimonials should be mailed before February 1st, 1961, to: The Chairman, Department of English, University of Alberta, EDMONTON.

CORRECTED SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM SALARIES IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES 1960-61¹

Arranged in order of the average minima for the top three grades.

<i>University</i>	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Associate</i>	<i>Assistant</i>	<i>Lecturer</i>
Toronto	12,000	9,000	7,000	5,500
U.B.C.	12,000	9,000	7,000	—
Victoria	12,000	9,000	7,000	—
Manitoba	11,800	9,000	7,000	—
Saskatchewan	11,700	9,000	7,000	—
Queen's	11,500	8,700	6,700	5,200
McGill	11,500	8,500	6,500	5,000
Laval	11,200	8,500	6,700	5,000
Alberta	11,500	8,500	6,000	—
Western Ontario	10,500	8,500	6,500	5,500
Montréal	10,500	8,200	6,400	5,800
McMaster	10,290	8,010	6,300	5,100
Carleton	10,000	8,500	6,500	—
University of Waterloo ² ..	9,915	8,120	6,330	4,765
Sir George Williams	9,700	7,500	6,200	4,500
Memorial	9,500	8,000	6,500	—
O.A.C.	9,000	7,800	6,000	5,000
O.V.C.	9,000	7,800	6,000	5,000
Dalhousie	9,500	7,500	5,500	3,500
Assumption	9,000	7,500	5,800	4,500
U.N.B.	9,400	7,300	5,500	3,500
Nova Scotia Tech.	8,500	8,000	6,000	4,000
Waterloo College	8,900	7,500	6,000	4,500
Bishop's	9,000	7,500	5,500	4,500
Ottawa	8,500	7,500	6,000	4,500
Mt. Allison	7,600	6,000	5,200	4,000
Acadia	5,250	4,200	3,465	2,940

¹Data supplied by R. D. Mitchener, Higher Education Section, Education Division, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

²20% higher for those who teach 9 months in the year instead of 7½ months.

The Civil Service Commission of Canada
invites applications for the positions of

DIRECTORS OF STUDIES

for

CANADIAN SERVICE COLLEGES

at

ROYAL ROADS,
British Columbia.

SALARY — Up to \$12,500

COLLEGE ROYAL MILITAIRE DE ST. JEAN,
Saint Jean, P.Q.

SALARY — Up to \$13,500

For details concerning the Service Colleges and the above positions, please write immediately to the CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, OTTAWA, and ask for Information Circular 61-2025A.



“ You may stop
a man’s mouth
by crammin’ a book
down his throat,
but you won’t
convince him. ”

*Sam Slick’s Wise Saws;
Thomas Chandler Haliburton, 1853*

IMPERIAL OIL
LIMITED

—from the Imperial Oil collection.

Now Ready . . .

**WEBSTER'S NEW
COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY**

(1960 copyright)

- A genuine Merriam-Webster product.
- The most complete handy-sized reference for college use.
- Available in dark blue linen binding, with specially made thin paper. Plain \$5.50
Thumb-indexed \$6.50.

Usual discounts

THOMAS ALLEN, LIMITED

266 King St. West

Toronto 2B

MARTIN FRÈRES

CLARINETS

AND WOODWINDS

BUESCHER and LAMONTE

BAND INSTRUMENTS



**BUEGELEISEN &
JACOBSON LTD.**

7820 BATHURST ST. TORONTO, ONT.

GEO. L. HORNBERGER

Canadian Representative

*Write For Free Catalogue On All
Musical Instruments*

SEE YOUR LOCAL DEALER

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY

Three separate texts by C. W. Wood, Late Senior Science Master, St. Bees School and A. K. HOLLIDAY, Senior Lecturer in Inorganic and Physical Chemistry, University of Liverpool, England. 401, 344 and 330 pages respectively, illustrated, **\$4.25 each.**

These books are designed as textbooks for senior school courses and for first year textbooks for university and college courses. Each book is complete in itself and may be used independently of the others. The books will be of value to university students taking a first year chemistry course leading either to a degree in chemistry or to a degree in some other science subject.

Write for full details to:

BUTTERWORTH & CO. (CANADA) LIMITED

1367 Danforth Avenue, Toronto 6, Ontario.



How About That ?

- ELIMINATES CHALK DUST
- PROTECTS CHALKBOARD
- IMPROVES READABILITY

Also Manufacturers of:

- * DETERGENTS
- * WAXES (NON SLIP)
- * BACTERICIDES
- * INSECTICIDES
- * AND ACCESSORIES

Choisy Laboratories
LTD

Louiseville Qué., Canada - Capital 8-4383

Montreal Sales Office: UNuversity 1-2000
Branches throughout Canada



Coming in February

A HISTORICAL ATLAS OF CANADA

- published under the auspices of the Canadian Historical Association
- over 120 maps with accompanying text
- over 30 statistical diagrams and political charts

Editor:

DR. D. G. G. KERR, Professor of History, University of Western Ontario.

Chief Cartographer:

MAJOR C. C. J. BOND, Army Historian Section,
Department of National Defence

SEND FOR FREE BROCHURE

THOMAS NELSON & SONS (CANADA) LTD.

91 Wellington Street West
TORONTO 1, ONTARIO

MADE IN CANADA

Northern Electric

SERVES YOU BEST

with
COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT
ELECTRICAL WIRES AND CABLES
ELECTRICAL SUPPLIES
ELECTRICAL APPARATUS

Ad. No. 6660-19



*"Go to India . . .
the Taj alone, is
worth the trip."*



But India offers so much MORE! Indescribably lovely as is the Taj Mahal, it is only one of the wonders this fabulous land presents to the traveller . . . the Festivals . . . almost unbelievable in their colour . . . the flash of jewels on an elephant's state harness . . . the animation of the crowds . . . the whole fascinating picture of this giant of a country, with its roots deep in the mysterious past, its eyes steadfastly fixed on the promising future. See the sweep of the golden sands of Malabar . . . the austere and awe-inspiring grandeur of the Himalayas . . . meet the sensitive people, proud of their historic past . . . learn of their cultures, the fantastic pot pourri of Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Jains, Parsis, Buddhists, which make India the enigma of the world.

Come to India . . . a soft "Welcome Memsahib, Sahib," awaits you.

India

The new Mecca of the sophisticated traveller!

Inquire from your Travel Agent . . . or from

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TOURIST, OFFICE,
177-179 King Street West, Toronto. EM. 2-3188.



MIRROR OF CANADA

A de luxe photographic portrait of Canada today compiled by the ROYAL CANADIAN GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. Includes 19 pages in full colour. \$8.50

A CANADIAN ERRANT

For 25 years JAMES P. MANION was a Canadian Trade Commissioner in nations throughout the world. Here he offers an absorbing account of his work. \$5.00

MEDICINE IN THE MAKING

Famous as a surgeon and medical scientist, DR. GORDON MURRAY gives an enthralling account of his career. \$5.50

DARWIN IN RETROSPECT

Five scholars from Carleton University discuss various aspects of Darwin's influence on the thought of the past hundred years. Paper covers, \$1.75

WRITING IN AMERICA

A fresh and uncompromising appraisal of the fiction, poetry and drama being written today in the United States. \$3.95

RIDDLE OF A CHANGING WORLD

SIR PHILIP GIBBS predicts how the amazing developments in modern science may affect man in future decades. \$4.00

THE RYERSON PRESS


299 QUEEN STREET WEST
TORONTO 2-B, ONTARIO

WINTER IS THE TIME TO THINK OF SUMMER

(AND TCA)

Relax a little. When you've read this, close your eyes and plan a little:

Europe. A short, jet-smooth night away. London? Paris? (Quatorze juillet, perhaps — dancing in the streets!) Zurich? (Don't worry about Schwyzerdutsch — that's a secret language — *you'll* do fine with English, anywhere.) Then of course there's Ireland, Scotland, Germany, and Austria, and Belgium...

Mainly, there is what  *you* would like to do and see and learn on your vacation. The more there is of that, the more worth while it is to think of TCA and BOAC — the two great airlines who offer you the finest, most frequent services to Europe you could ask for. Your ticket doesn't just buy transportation — it's your admission to history, art, music, leisurely lounging or serious study . . .

Perhaps the time has come to stop dreaming — and to start planning! If you'd like expert help, ask your Travel Agent. He'll be delighted to talk to you!

P.S. Don't forget to ask about TCA's Extra Cities Plan: A ticket to Vienna for instance, lets you see fifteen other European cities at no extra cost! Of course, there's TCA's 'Pay Later' Plan — only 10% down, up to 24 months for the rest. Direct or connecting flights are leaving from airports near your home . . . anyway, summer travel is likely to be heavy. It's best to book early, so see your Travel Agent, TCA or BOAC office soon.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES



AIR CANADA

OFFICIAL SPEED RECORD HOLDER — CANADA-BRITAIN
